DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 110 CE 038 041

AUTHOR Roach, Noreen
TITLE Futuring: Where Do We Go From Here?
PUB DATE 5 Dec 83
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the American Vocational Association Convention (Anaheim, CA, December 5, 1983). Document may not reproduce well.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Data Analysis; Data Collection; Definitions; Demography; Economic Change; *Educational Change; Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; Educational Trends; *Futures (of Society); Long Range Planning; Models; Needs Assessment; *Occupational Home Economics; Organizational Change; Postsecondary Education; *Program Improvement; Relevance (Education); Secondary Education; Social Change; State Departments of Education; *Statewide Planning; Teacher Role; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

The New York State Department of Education formed a committee called the Statewide Administrative Futuring Committee. The major purpose of the committee was to determine and assess the impact of the major trends that would affect education in New York State and to reorient the state's educational programs toward the future. Using data collected from literature reviews and from three surveys, the committee members determined that the primary challenges that will face occupational education in New York in the future are declining enrollments, financial restraints, and the changing business and industrial environment. To respond to these changes, the members of the futuring committee developed an educational futuring model for use in New York. Among the data collection and data analysis methods and techniques incorporated into the model were the following: trend analysis, Delphi survey techniques, surveys that include second round averages and responses, future wheels, and cross-impact matrices. When the model was applied to occupational home economics, it was concluded that perhaps the most important lesson that secondary vocational education could teach is that the student is in charge of his or her own life and career. In the future, the role of the home economics teacher will be that of a facilitator whose objective is to help students give rational direction to social change instead of merely responding to given situations. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
N Roach
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED239110

FUTURING: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

Speech Given by Noreen Roach

Department Chairman, Cornwall Central High School, Cornwall, New York
Adjunct, New York University, New York City, New York

December 5, 1983--AVA Convention, Anaheim, California

Let me wish you all a good afternoon. It is a pleasure to spend my time, my energy, and use my expertise doing what comes naturally--planning for a future that includes what I believe in. My goals this afternoon are really four.

* To understand what a process for change is
* To help you recognize one's role in educational decision making
* To begin to look at the New York State model for change
* To share with you NAVHET's approach to perceived change

Carolyn Davis, NAVHET President, chose me to chair the NAVHET Futuring Committee. As a member of the Statewide Administrative Futuring Committee in New York State for the State Education Department, I received a great deal of experience seeing the broad picture of futuring in our state. I was one of a handful of classroom teachers who looked at the NYS occupational system for education which serves over a million students and over 700 school districts with a vocational staff of 26,000! As you see, the numbers are quite impressive. The futuring project in NYS was a mammoth undertaking.

Why me on that committee? I have no illusions of grandeur; I'm merely an expert. Do you know how they define an expert from my point of view? "Ex" stands for "has been." And what is a "pert"? Anyone in foods and nutrition knows that a pert is a "drip under pressure." You are now going to have a presentation by a "has been drip under pressure."

The reason I was probably chosen has not a thing to do with expertise. The main reason I was picked is the politics of the thing. Education today is politics as well as big business and industry. These three words describe education in New York State. It is politics because at that point in time I happened to be the President Elect of the New York State Occupational Education Association.

What was this all about from my point of view? Four major concerns crossed my mind as I sat in that room with the eighteen men and two women on this committee. First, one had to have a grasp of what futuring techniques were. Second, one had to have a grasp of what the educational issues really were in New York State. Third, one had to have a grasp of the major trends in New York State and the United States. And last, one had to be willing to read lots and lots; one had to be willing to learn so that one could ask the <u>right</u> questions. So when I walked out of that first meeting of our new state committee, I recognized that in front of me stood a tremendous job--something I had not anticipated prior to being there. I probably would have refused the job if I had understood it at the time.

CE038041

What is futuring? Futuring is the process by which an outlook or institution is reoriented toward the future. A World Future Society document explains it by applying it to education, "Futurizing a curriculum is different from merely updating it. It signifies a general commitment to make education relevant to the student's needs in the future." According to the literature there is a fundamental difference between traditional long-range planning and futurism. The planner generally extrapolates from the present and the past, the futurist attempts to look at all reasonable possibilities. This is a very different form of thinking.

So what did I do? I felt a sense of importance in this whole process. I became anxious when I recognized that New York State was about to change so I researched educational change. Let me share some of this with you.

Author Carl Rogers views change in more simplistic and yet dramatic terms when he states that change is altered perceptions which are first seen as ridiculous nonsense or worse, by the collective, common sense of the time. He feels that every social revolution is preceded by, or brings with it, a change in the perception of the world or a change in the perception of the possible or both.

Researcher Mathew Miles looks at planned change with the question of how change processes can be managed in a meaningful sense of that word. He pursues the change agent's role and develops the process through the use of a study of the health of an organization. Mr. Miles defines change in a logical and ordered pattern and appears to ignore chance change.

In Lippitt's, The Dynamics of Planned Change, I noted where Mathew Miles got his thinking. I found this to be an interesting book, because as I read, I had a sense of New York State. Change can be spontaneous, developmental change within the system or fortuitous, unplanned change outside the system. Change can also be, according to Lippitt, planned change that originates in a decision to make a deliberate change to improve a system and to obtain the help of an outside agent called a change agent. He feels that the decision to make a change may be made by the system itself or by an outside agent who observes the need for change in a particular system and takes the initiative in establishing a helping relationship to make the system work.

In discussing change in education, Kurt Lewin states, "It seems to be easier for society to change education than for education to change society." Inherent in this statement is his belief in a general cultural atmosphere that pervades society and affects education. The general cultural characteristics of freedom, authority and social atmosphere are able to provide observed differences that aid the social researcher on his journey toward change.

Lewin suggests that one consider three positive general principles for change, especially group change. First is that change has to be a change of group atmosphere rather than of single items.

It must be deeper than the verbal level or the level of social or legal formalities. Secondly, any real change of the culture of a group is interwoven with the changes of power constellations within the group--divide and conquer, reshape and redefine. Thirdly, change in methods of leadership is the quickest way to bring about a change in cultural atmosphere of a group. That is exactly what happened in New York State. All three of those criteria were met in the past two years.

Griffiths suggests that system theory serve as a model for a theory of administrative change. He states that an organization be considered as an open system and administration as an open sub-system with the environment being a supra-system. The administrative sub-system is located at the point of tangency of the three systems. This would lead one to hypothesize that change would be relatively infrequent. Open systems maintain themselves in steady states which is one of the major problems with change in organizations. Change calls for the establishment of new ratios among the components of the system. This is a basis for developing Griffiths' conditions for aiding change.

Since he sees organizations as having a tendency to maintain a steady state, he feels that the main impetus for change comes from <u>without</u> rather than <u>within</u>. Furthermore, he feels that the degree and duration of change is directly proportional to the intensity of the stimulus from the supra-system. Practical administrators are well aware of this and demonstrate their ability through the use of consultants, committees and professional organizations from outside to do their job. In a study of school superintendents quoted by Mr. Griffiths, it was found that those appointed from inside the system tend to act in such a way as to maintain the system. Bringing in outsiders will in fact bring about change more quickly.

Where "Futuring" will go at this point is only an educated guess. That change will occur in Occupational Education in New York State is an absolute. The experts have proven that the State Education Department has done its homework with a few exceptions, and that society is dynamic and the status quo cannot be maintained. These two facts will bring about change at the grass roots level by the mid-eighties.

What did New York State really do? It decided as a state to change what was in fact the organization of the State Education Department. The actual politics of futuring I will put to one side since this is not a setting for that discussion. New York State had three issues that we saw happening, and you have probably experienced the same in your areas.

These challenges facing occupational and practical arts education in New York State are

* First, <u>Declining Enrollments</u>. We had a student population of 1.5 million in 1965 when I started teaching in New York State. It went up to almost 2 million population during the key years 1965 to

1970. Now we have had a steady decline year by year. That is a major change. You're talking about 700 districts, and almost every one of these districts could eliminate a school building, staff, and/or support systems.

In this changing educational environment, people wanted more for their money. Accountability came out in the mid 1970s. For those of you that have been around a long time you'll recognize this. When I was in college, we had the same accountability when we had the Sputnik scare.

Second, Financial Restraints. Money has been a major problem and continues to be. For an example, look at staffing. You are looking at an average teacher in New York State when you look at me. The average teacher is about forty years old, has an average of twenty years experience, and is making $25,000 or more a year. That is an expensive school district pattern. There are many ramifications from that. Most of our teachers in New York State are highly educated. They have a Master's Degree or better.

Third, Changing Business/Industrial Environment. New York is not an industrial state and has not been for a long time, but it only began to realize this about ten years ago. We are an information state. Practically everything in business and industry done in New York State is done in some facet or another through services or information with the emphasis on information. When you put all three together; declining enrollments, financial restraints, and changing business/industrial environment, it is evident that something had to give in New York.

In response to these challenges, a massive multi-million dollar effort was begun to plan and organize for the Futuring Project in the Office of Occupational and Continuining Education. Key elements of the plan for a relevant and cost effective curriculum included:

Business/Industry Identify--What
Educators Identify--How
Statewide Input
Prescriptive Curriculum
Statewide Student Evaluation
Instructional Management System
Five Year Plan

The State Education Department recognized the need for change simply because the state had in fact changed. The needs of the students graduating from the high schools are different from the needs of the students when the original concepts of schools were set up. The curriculum shape has to change. What is relevant for an individual living in 1990 or the year 2000? Is what we are doing today truly necessary?

Two types of people provide information on the future. They are

FORECASTERS--Demographics
Statistics

FUTURISTS--Probable
Possible
Preferable

When you do forecast, you get a feel for things and nothing more than that. Most facts and figures are demographics and statistics. Let me give you an example of a statistic--52% of the work force of the United states is very shortly going to be female. We are going to be the majority of the workers in this country. In the year 1900 if I had stood in front of an audience and said one day more than half the work force would be female, people would have laughed me out of the room.

Let's look at a few statistics which forecasters provide regarding population and are available to anyone.

* Median Age of population has increased by 2 years in the past decade.
* Number of households has increased by 3 times the population and one quarter of the households being people living alone.
* Teen suicides are the third most common cause of death in teens.
* Obesity is most common nutritional disorder.
* 1/4 of the population 25-34 years old graduated from college in 1978!
* California will have a 36.7% change in population from 1970-2000.

THE BULGE--BABY BOOM POPULATION IS AGING:
This population is the bulk of the US population and
In 1990 they will be 25 to 45 years old
In 2000 they will be 35 to 55 years old
In 2010 they will be 45 to 65 years old

By the year 2010, this massive population of the United States will have finished careers, jobs, and whatever they would have done in their productive years. They will be out there retiring, recreating, or doing whatever.

Joanna Smith, one of the Past Presidents of HEEA, in an article for the Home Economics Education Association says:
"Feminization of Poverty" is becoming the hallmark of US society...
"44% of female-headed households and children under 18 were below poverty level...
"Of that percent, 66% of female households below the poverty line are not in the labor force at all..."

In a letter from Phyllis Barton, Past President of NAVHET, she writes about hiring a PR firm. "We are truly faced with the work of the Governor's task force in Virginia as well as the national efforts in A Nation at Risk.

"All of the elective teachers have felt a definite strain and so we have hired a public relations person to work with us in getting the word out to the right audiences. We home economics teachers are certainly getting publicity and reactions from other elective groups, teachers associations, and community persons who have become aware of us."

In the Journal of Home Economics winter issue of 1982, there were several recommendations made on futuring. They were

1. Sit down and think!
2. Become future literate
3. Look at alternatives
4. Take risks

The last newsletter featured the work of the Future Development Committee. The FDC is taking a philosophical approach to alternative futures for the profession of home economics. AHEA is looking at a time frame that stretches forward 20, 30, 40 years from now and has:

Plan of Action--"The goal of FDC is to promote the critical self-examination of home economics as a profession.

Priority Issues--"Focus--Does home economics focus on the 'family' the 'home,' 'home and family,' 'families and individuals'? It has been suggested that 'home,' 'family,' and 'individual' are very different concepts, and that our most fundamental problem is that we have confused a commitment to famiy life with a commitment to home life. There is a need to reconceptualize the fundamental meanings of such terms and reach consensus on mission.

Core--"Is there a common body of knowledge required for all home economists to achieve an integrated perspective? If so, at what level should such a core be required: lower division, upper division, graduate level? What are the basic components of such a core?

Specialization--"Is home economics an integrated profession focusing on families, or should it be a federation of career-oriented specialities? Can we simultaneously and rationally uphold both perspectives (i.e., specialization and integration), or is there lack of reasoned consistency between the two?

Professional status--"Does a four-year undergraduate progam produce a 'true' professional? What should be the relationship between two-year, four-year, and graduate programs? What distinguishes the technician from the paraprofessional and the professional? What should the secondary school program in home economics be and do?

Career Orientation--"Does service to families and concern for their welfare take precedence over self-serving activities of entrepreneurship? How do such programs as fashion merchandising, interior design, business, etc., relate to the mission of home economics?

Process and Product--"The future for home economics, however, will be largely one of our own making. An awareness of future alternatives develops out of a knowledge of past events and their observed consequences, and our future will be determined by what we

choose to do today and tomorrow. What others observe about home economics is what all of us do; not a committee, and not some obscure publication, or program outline."

Millie Reel, former Executive Director of the Future Homemakers of America, says "The days of emphasizing clothing construction and cooking skills must be put to rest. These are frills and skills to be left to those who concentrate on these as hobbies or special career goals. Mastering all living skills takes precedence over specific skill areas."

Why not Relationships?
Child rearing/care?
Management and conservation?
Consumer education?
Nutrition and health?
Career and job preparation?

Margorie Brown, from the University of Minnesota, says "To view such matters as economics, technology, and demographic factors in isolation as social context of the purposes of education is not really to understand them.

"--Students need to be educated to give rational direction to social change. Most are just trained to respond to a given situation."

In summary, current trends point to the following predictions for the future:

--A larger proportion of our population will be 65 and older
--More children will be growing up in single-parent homes
--Dual paycheck families will increase
--The divorce rate will increase
--The number of displaced homemakers (male and female) will increase
--Inflation will increase
--The cost of energy will increase
--Obesity will continue as a major health problem
--More families will adopt lifestyles of voluntary simplicity
--More families will practice the economics of less, the economics of self-reliance, and the economics of home-centered production

Aleene Cross, from the University of Georgia, says "Looking ahead, one needs to fit the needs of individuals and families of <u>all</u> ages--education is dynamic and lifelong. People must begin to look to the future and to meet those lifelong needs."

Dr. Peggy Meszaros, from Oklahoma State University, says about Trend/Challenges: "Many youth have <u>not</u> been 'habilitated' so one has a real task in <u>rehabilitation</u>! Home Economics should play a role in <u>prevention</u> of high risk youth problems." So Peggy doesn't think rehabilitation works.

LONG RANGE PLANNING

According to the literature there is a fundamental difference between traditional long-range planning and futurism. The planner generally extrapolates from the present and the past, while the futurist attempts to look at all reasonable possibilities.

It is this hypothesis that sets the stage for the New York State model. In developing the model the methods of study of futurists groups were used. These include Trend Analysis which attempts to identify new and emerging trends that potentially could influence the future. Trends in New York State Education were identified through frequent samplings and surveys of a desired or targeted audience.

A second method was the Delphi Survey techniques made popular by the Rand Corporation and based on future forecasting of ancient Greeks. The survey is structured around a list of possible future alternatives usually identified through brainstorming sessions or trend analysis. Surveys are sent to a group of experts or internal managers depending on the purpose. The survey asks the individuals opinion of the likelihood that each event will occur by a selected date. Responses are usually recorded on a five (5) point Likert scale. Results are tabulated and returned in a second survey. Participants are asked to respond to the survey again considering the average rating of the experts. Also in the second survey, participants are asked to give a rationale where their responses differ markedly from the average.

A third survey is also conducted presenting the second round averages and responses. In other words you try to gain a consensus and sharpen people's opinion with pressure. The results of the third round represent a consensus of most likely futures. This was the basis for the Rand Corporation decision-making model and became the one used in New York State for Futuring.

A method of study of the future that can be used is the Future Wheel. This technique examines the most likely consequences from a specific trend. This enables a group to examine the impact of a trend on the organization. The technique asks individuals in small groups to agree on a potential consequence(s). Based on initial consequences and then the groups are asked to list second and third level consequences. An item is only listed as a consequence if the entire group agrees. The total list of consequences gives some indication of the impact of a trend.

And still another method is the Cross-Impact Matrix. This technique is used to refine the information developed in future wheels and identify related impact. The identified trends and major consequences can be set up on a matrix to examine the inter-relationships of these consequences. In some cases the new result will be more positive, more negative or no net effect whatsoever.

The final tool in futuring is Scenario Writing which is a narrative version of the potential impact of a trend. The results of a future wheel can be polished into a scenario which describes a glimpse of a future setting. The scenario fully describes the results of several emerging trends. While the scenario will not be accurate in all details, it does present a futuristic glimpse of probable futures which will assist program planning and policy development.

I have given you what has happened in New York State, what futuring is, a survey of what people in our profession have been saying that is more or less related to futuring, and I have tried to explain to you the tools that were used.

We should at least spend a few minutes on the national picture that is change in our nation and in education. It would be remiss of me to leave this room without bringing up the topic.

I would like to provide input from one of our former greats, Alvin Toffler. I use his book, Third Wave, in the classroom in my adolesent psychology course and have for years. He has actually defined change in terms of waves which is very easy to use with students and people who are not familiar with change and futuristic thinking. We have in the world three waves of human beings, and they are all hitting the same shoreline. If you can envision this happening, it is very easy to see change. We have the first little wave that comes rippling in, late at night, the tide has subsided, and everything is still. This represents the agricultural society that we had. The way it used to be. Oh, how many of us wish we could go back to the farm and start over or just stay there! Many of us never would have left if we had known what was going to happen. Then you have your second wave--the people in the cities. They came when we had to bring people together for industry. Workers had to be close by so that they could be efficient and effective for the plant.

We now have the third wave which is a tidal wave. In this wave we have a situation where our cities and our structures are beginning to crumble. They cannot meet the needs of today's people. The tidal wave of change is hitting our country and the world at such a fast pace, that it is going to sweep a lot of people out and under. They are going to drown. If you read Toffler's book, you can envision that concept step by step by step. Sections that are particularly interesting for your reading are two chapters--one on families and one on the electronic cottage because those have direct impact on the classroom. I use them all the time. He does see in the third wave the lessening of importance of standardization, sychronization, centralization, maximization and concentration in the work force along with increased individuality. For example, we have witnessed the merging of the Cabbage Patch Doll with the computer. That doll is a sensation since every one is a bit different simply because the computer is able to do that individualization.

When he met with the Futuring Committees in New York State and gave his presentation, Toffler said, "The family has been called the 'great shock absorber of society,' the place where the bruised and battered individual returns after doing battle with the world." Families and educators are aware of this, but what is being done?

Futurist John Nesbitt cannot be overlooked. He has very nicely identified some of the major trends. His book, Megatrends, talks about ten trends, but he now agrees there are eleven. This key message, besides the trends, is that change is subtle and fundamental, therefore, we tend not to see it, whereas we do see fads which change quickly and visibly. It's an excellent concept to think about. Look around your own school district in the last five years. There have been many changes that probably as single items you have not been fully involved with or aware of their impact on you. Now really, look around you and you will see all of those things that have impacted on you very subtly and slowly. As teachers we do have to think futuristly so that we can become aware of what is going to make a change in our lives.

Nesbitt identifies the following trends:

1. Industrial Society ----> Information Society
2. Forced Technology ----> High Tech/High Touch
3. National Economy ----> World Economy
4. Short Term ----> Long Term
5. Centralization ----> Decentralization
6. Institutional Help ----> Self-Help
7. Representative Democracy ----> Participatory Democracy
8. Hierarchies ----> Networking
9. North ----> South
10. Either/Or ----> Multiple Option
11. Adrogency will come!

So what about the country? Two years of extensive study of the current condition of the American public high school is reflected in High School, a report by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The book was written by Ernest I. Boyer, President of the foundation, and a former U.S. Commissioner of Education. In that report he says the current debate about the quality of schools is by no means unique. Twenty-five years ago with Sputnik we met the challenge by increased Federal Aid in Math and Science and reliance on local property taxes for carrying out the mandate. Ernest Boyer believes that the future of the USA depends on public education not on the private sector and the battle for the future of America will be won/lost in these schools, especially the public school systems.

There is the Excellence Report, A Nation at Risk of which everyone is aware. To discuss A Nation at Risk is to discuss the so-called "New Basics." The report prescribes strong medicine for an ailing educational system. These curricular areas, perhaps not as new in content as in the recommended dosage, commanded most of the attention of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, the high-level panel of experts convened in 1981 by Secretary of Education T. H. Bell to diagnose the problem.

There is at least the scent of elitism in the commission's attitude toward other kinds of courses. The report criticizes the "time spent learning to cook" counting as much toward a high school diploma as, say, time spent in chemistry. It shouldn't be necessary to point out that the study of individual and family nutrition--subjects that have a good deal to do with chemistry--are an important part of general education, but the report tends to ignore that. But again, it is a major supra-system impact effecting home economics.

The Paidea Report which was one done on curriculum design says the standard curriculum would have three parts. First, the acquisition of organized knowledge: language, literature, the fine arts, mathematics, natural science, history, geography, and social studies. Second, the development of intellectual skills: reading, writing, speaking, listening, calculating, problem-solving, observing, measuring, estimating, and exercising critical judgment. Third, an enlarged understanding of ideas and values including discussion of books and other works of art, and involvement in artistic activities such as music, drama and visual arts. That report has a tremendous impact on curriculum, and it almost ignored vocational education as if our curriculums didn't do anything. As we are well aware but obviously others are not we are definitely involved particularly in the enlargement of understanding of ideals and values.

In addition to the basic curriculum, there would be auxiliary studies in physical education and health (12 years) and "manual training" (6 to 8 years). The latter would include "the household arts of cooking and sewing, carpentry, machine repair, typing etc."

The conclusions are obviously inconsistent and leave the impression that the commission knew little about the purposes and values of vocational education and was unaware of community support for vocational education programs. Whose fault is it that they are not aware?

The National Academy of Science Report of 1981 is the first one that came out that is pro voc ed. The U.S. Department of Education asked the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences to study the joint efforts of business, community groups, and public agencies in preparing local residents for jobs. It was concerned mainly about the potential for collaborative vocational education projects to improve the employability of minorities in economically depressed areas. What it got was a report that focuses more specifically on youth and more generally on vocational education in secondary schools.

While the theme of Education for Tomorrow's Jobs is far more limited than that of other recent studies of the high school, the recommendations are far more supportive of vocational education. The focus is on strengthening vocational education's capacity to prepare young people not going on to college to meet employers' needs. The report states that "providing an effective array of vocational education opportunities is a role in public high schools equal in importance to their role of preparing students for college." It complains that vocational education "has long been slighted in favor of academic education."

And I now say to you, "It is time for all home economics teachers to jump out of the airplane." The airplane of that comfortable little classroom and into a new world out there. I'm not necessarily advocating that you jump out of the airplane with me and actually skydive.

When I jump out of an airplane, there is a certain beauty in that process. You have the whole world before you and you are in total control. You pull those riggers and just go with the wind and pick up the flow where you want it to take you and you let it take you there. You can control yourself. You can control the direction of home economics in your schools and your communities and your states and in the United States. We are the crew, but I'm not convinced we think we can control the direction of Home Economics; and, therefore, we have not tried it. Unfortunately, classroom teachers in any profession not only in home economics have been told by the college level community and by the people above us and in control that we should just follow along. We have not been given the opportunity to give the input with clout that we can definitely provide. We are an intelligent, educated group of human beings. So I took on the challenge of doing this NAVHET futuring and helping to define the home economics teacher who I know is out there and that the world doesn't seem to know.

Stage One was that a committee of home economics teachers from across the United States devoted time last summer to conducting a survey of trends, and we came to conclusions similar to the experts.

Perhaps the most important lesson secondary vocational education could teach is that the student is in charge of his or her own life and career--and that is one of the important differences between education and training.

Major populations to be served by Home Economics over the next two decades emerge as both males and females in various categories. The determination of populations to be served must be arrived at based on the needs of the local situation. Populations applicable in one community may be vastly different from another community in the same state. A profile of the community using demographic, social, and economic data should be compiled before final decisions are made. The following scheme proposes one way of viewing some possible populations to be served within a community setting.

I developed and distributed a very simplistic trend analysis survey to people in NAVHET who were identified by, your president, Carolyn Davis. If you did not get a copy of the report regarding the survey, the information is in the Fall newsletter and the names are listed there. For the survey we took seven categories of individuals including teachers. I was very pleased to be able to have an opportunity to go to Georgia in the summer of 1983. I was able to survey over 800 teachers there thanks to the graciousness of their state director, Frances King.

We identified the same trends that Nesbitt identified, the same concerns and trends that Toffler identified, the same trends and concerns that directors identified and that employers identified. As home economists, we know what is happening. I am convinced now that we know, but we don't know what to do about it.

In New York State, our problem has been everybody knows that there is a problem, everybody knows why there is a problem, but what home economics people aren't sure about is what to do. There is no doubt in my mind what we do in terms of each home economics person facing the future. In terms of futuring, most Home Economics teachers in New York State would honestly look at you right now and say we're going to be out of jobs in a year and a half because they don't understand futuring; they do not understand change, and they are in a state of panic. They have been educated as much as you can educate 26,000 occupational teachers.

So were talking education not only of New York State home economics teachers but you, and that helps the student as well. Now I'm at the hard part of my presentation. It's a piece of cake to sit down and write a paper. It's not a piece of cake to help people be able to think and move and take what facts they may not be sure they know and bring about change. Facilitating is probably the best job of any teacher, and the most successful teacher is the one that help the child do the job.

So what were the trends that NAVHET's groups actually came up with? Four broad areas came up over and over again. Out of the thousands of people who responded, 1218 to be exact, about 80 percent of those people said economic issues. Number two was technological issues. Third issue was the social issues. The last was political issues.

In terms of the economy and federal, state, and local dollars, don't think you're going to go down the tubes just because the government are going to take away a few federal dollars. You might say yes it is, but you're assuming you need equipment. The future of teaching in Home Economics Education may not require equipment. That's going to frighten a whole lot of home economics teachers. Ladies and gentlemen, for the last nine years I have not regularly used a stove, refrigerator, sewing machine, or seam ripper in the classroom. I used them at home, of course, and I'm surviving very nicely. I eat, sleep, and do everything every American does. But, what we forget is, there are a whole lot of Americans out there that never were in a Home Economics class, and do survive. They do not perceive survival skills as being sewing, cooking, etc.

We need to begin to redefine what in fact the Home Economics Teacher does best--and do pretty much what few people really want to hear, and that is, begin to concentrate on what is to be more viable down the road. It may mean cooking, sewing, are going to really have to go. The argument I hear over and over again from teachers is 'when I teach my students how to make a teeshirt they're learning management, they're learning time use, they're learning money management and consumer education. I'm here to tell you if you sat in a classroom with that teacher, you will see what she is teaching. She's teaching those kids that a seam ripper belongs in drawer one. That you had better read this step and then get it okayed with me before you go to the next step because you can't make decisions on your own. Because every decision you make is going to be a wrong one. That everyone needs to have a teeshirt that has just one kind of neck line because I'm only going to teach one kind of neck line. Don't ask me to do a vee neck since we can all do curved ones and not have to cover that issue at all. What in fact do you teach? Those are the ones who are screaming about getting rid of sewing machines. Because they don't understand that they're not teaching. Ask yourself "What do you teach?" what is taking place in a lot of Home Economics rooms puts me to shame. No wonder there are schools out there that say we don't need these programs. No wonder there are States out there saying why do we have to have this. What makes this basic? So the soul searching needs to take place. We as a group do not define Home Economics Teacher, do not provide the direction. I am here to tell you, you are going to be defined, and in that definition you may be eliminated.

We are at the point where the supra system is going to over take us. That change will happen, whether in fact you want it or not, is fact. We are seeing it in New York State. We can see it in the country. Let's get together and make it happen right.

RESOURCES TO CONTACT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Academy for Educational Development
680 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10019
(212) 265-3350

California Tomorrow
John Abbott
681 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105

Cambridge Research and
Development Group
Norwalk, Connecticut 06856
Contact: James Webber
(203) 853-1313

Center for Futures Research,
University of Southern California-
Graduate School of Business Adminis.
University Park,
Los Angeles, California 90007
Contact: Burt Nanus
(213) 746-2451

Central Florida Community College
Ocala, Florida 32678
Contact: Ernest Jernigan
(904) 237-2111

DCM Associates
908 Fox Plaza
San Francisco, California 94102
Contact: David Miller

Forecasting International, Inc.
Arlington, Virginia
Contact: Marvin Cetron

Futures Group, The
Glastonburg, Connecticut 06033
(203) 633-6743

Futures Committee
University of Wisconsin-Superior
Superior, Wisconsin 54880
Contact: David Stinson

Goals for Dallas
Dr. Bryghte Fodbold
825 One Main Place
Dallas, Texas 75250

Hawaii 2000, George Chaplin
Governor's Commission of the
Year 2000, Univ. of Hawaii,
2500 Dole Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Industrial Management Center, Inc.
Technology Forecasting
1411 West Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701
Contact: Patricia Olson
(512) 476-2038

Industrial Mangement Center Inc.
Hilton Head Island, SC 29938
Contact Person: James Bright
(803) 671-4814

Institute for the Future
Menlo Park, California 94025
Contact: Roy Amara
(415) 854-6322

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50010
Contact: Professor Don Hadwinger

Iowa
Jerry Parkin
523 East 12th Street
Governor's Commission of Futures
DesMoines, Iowa 50319
(515) 281-3711

Massachusetts Tomorrow
145 Hanover St.
Boston, Massachusetts 02108
(617) 006-1500
(Massachusetts Tomorrow monograph:
Prospects for Massachusetts)
$1.50, 56 Boylston St., Cambridge,
Massachusetts 02138
491-6350

National Science Foundation
Contact: Robert Lamson
Washington, DC
(202) 634-7672
Office of Exploratory Research and
Problem Assessment

NEXUS
Dupont Circle
Washington, DC
(202) 785-8480

Rocky Mountain Center
on the Environment
4260 East Evans Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80272
(307) 757-5439

Vermont Tomorrow
c/o Robert Babcock
26 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

World Futures Society
2850 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20008
(202) 667-5620

Home Economics: Its Dynamic Future
Mildred Reel, Executive Director
Future Homemakers of America

A Position on the Future Direction
of Home Economics Education
in the Schools
Marjorie M. Brown
Professor Emeritus
University of Minnesota

What's New in Home Ecomonics
New Priority in a New Age
Camille G. Bell, Ph.D.

Journal of Home Economics
Winter 1982
p. 17

Niagara Co. Community College
Sanborn, New York 14132
Contact: John Hunter
(716) 731-3271

Rhode Island 2000
P. O. Box 120
Annex Station
Providence, Rhode Island 02901

Washington 2000 Task Force
Alternatives for Washington
Marie Meld
3901 South Court Place
Seattle, Washington 98101
(800) 552-7108

Educational Policy Research Center
Syracuse, New York

The Third Wave
Alvin Toffler

Toward the Year 2000: Directions
For Home Economics Programs
Peggy S. Meszaros, Ph. D.

Future Directions For Home
Economics Occupations
Aleene A. Cross
Head, Home Economics Education
University of Georgia

The Home Economics Educator
Published by The Home Economics
Education Association
Volume II, Number 4, Summer 1983

The New York Times--Nov. 13, 1983
Education
Paying the Bill for School Reform
Edward B. Fiske